



Planning Commission

Work Session Minutes – February 18, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

6:45

A work session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Mike Tomy and was held in-person in the Planning Conference Room on February 18, 2026 at 1:05 PM. The meeting was recorded and streamed on Facebook in accordance with City Policy.

ATTENDEES

Members in attendance: Mike Tomy, Chairman, Bill Bardenwerper, Vice-Chairman, Libby Anderson, Clinton Hallman, Kim McFann, Benjie Morillo, and Bill Suter.

Staff in attendance: Curt Freese, Community Development Department Director, Christopher Klement, Planner III and Nicolas Navia, Planner I. Meadors Architecture, joined the meeting via Zoom.

DISCUSSION

7:00

Mr. Tomy asked if there were any general comments.

Eric Clausseen, the new Assistant City Manager, introduced himself.

Public Comment

None.

Public comment closed.

Mr. Freese stated that Adam Biery with the Architecture Firm Design Build is here to give the Planning Commission (PC) a presentation in relation to the liner buildings. Mr. Biery introduced himself and said he is working with Paul Trask to evaluate and/or look at the Code definition of liner buildings and the requirement for two stories; how to address the corner. His firm worked with Mr. Trask on the Chipotle and Five Guys Buildings.

CHAPTER 4 REVIEW

21:25

Mr. Freese stated at the last worksession the PC stopped at Section 4.5.12 – Gas/Fuel Stations and Car Washes, page 43 of 72. Mr. Tomy stated that he would like to go back to a detailed discussion after we finish the general discussion. Mr. Freese proposed to rewrite this section, adding the General Architectural Design and Lowcountry Design Elements.

PC agreed to not allow gas stations in the Historic District, referring to the gas station on the corner of Harrison Street and Boundary Street, which is grandfathered, and the gas station on the corner of Boundary Street where Subway used to be.

All were good with the vernacular standards. Mr. Freese referred to Page 46 of 72 and said the sentence *See definition of transparency below* needs to be deleted since it is referenced in another section. Mr. Tomy referred to Section 4.5.13 G.b (page 47 of 72) that says, *blank walls are prohibited along public streets* and feels it needs a definition. Mr. Freese said it is discussed on the previous page under Scale & Proportion. PC agreed to remove the Starbucks picture and the wording below the picture.

Mr. Morillo referred to a few drive-thrus that don't work (Dunkin Donut and Chick-Fil-A) and he proposed prohibiting drive-thrus within 250 feet of major intersections. Mr. Bardenwerper referred to a Stacking Study he did.

Mr. Tomy referred to Section 4.5.13.g, Drive-Thru Facilities Special Site Requirements and proposed adding the sentence, *Stacking study shall be made to substantiate the proposed stacking design*. Mr. Freese will make a note "TIA Required are the discretion of the administrator under 50 trips".

Mr. Freese stated that Jeremy Tate, staff consulting architect, put together the Drive-Thru Facilities Special Architectural Requirements. Mr. Tomy proposed under Section 4.5.13 H.b (page 47 of 72) to strike the words *strongly discouraged* and replace it with *not within the city of*. Mr. Tomy feels this needs to be reworded so that there is a stronger language in the code and that it needs to be consistent and coordinated with Lowcountry Vehicular Architecture. Mr. Freese will work on rewording this.

Mr. Freese stated there are not too many changes in Section 4.5.1.4 Civic Buildings. Mr. Tomy explained that he is an anti-terrorism force protection expert and also was a consultant for NY Yankees, Mets, NFL Stadiums, federal court buildings and does anti-terrorism protection. He said the PC should be aware of when designing a new civic or public buildings there needs to be an installation of something in the design stages relating to the exterior facilities. An example would be an old courthouse that has no room for a metal detector at the entryway. Ms. Anderson suggested this take place within the application requirements. Mr. Freese said there are no changes proposed for this section, but we can add a recommendation.

Mr. Tomy suggesting doing something simple under Civic Buildings & Institutions to say, *in consideration regarding security and anti-terrorism and force protection shall be provided for the proposal*. Mr. Tomy intends to do a presentation to the Fire Department as well as the Police Department.

PC agreed to what was done in the new Section 4.5.14 – Church and Institutional Buildings.

Mr. Freese stated that the PC has not reviewed Section 4.6: Building Design Standards yet. It needs to be clarified when it says, *district* is it referring to the historic district.

Mr. Tomy referred Section 4.6.1.H.3.a and wants to add to it the sentence *only be located on the property and on a public right-of-way*. Ms. Wilson referred to Section H.3.c which doesn't read grammatical right. PC agreed to after add the words *within public* after the words *displayed on*.

Mr. Freese stated that the Fencing in Section 4.6.1.1 and 4.6.1.2 have been moved to Chapter 5 under Landscaping.

Mr. Tomy referred to Section 4.6.3.A.1.b, and Section 4.6.3.A.5.c delete the words *smooth finish*.

Mr. Freese said in Section 4.6.3.A.9.h Faux wood grain textures will be removed.

PC agreed to put back into Section 4.6.2.c *Tabby*.

PC agreed to put back into Section 4.6.3.A.1.f, *Tabby (or stucco with oyster shell aggregate, typ.)*.

PC agreed in Section 4.6.3.A.4.d to remove *PVC*.

PC agreed in Section 4.6.3.A.7 to remove the entire paragraph.

PC agreed in Section 4.6.3.A.9.c to research the new product – do not prohibit.

PC agreed in Section 4.6.3.A.9.b to remove the words *and trim*.

PC agreed in Section 4.6.3.A.9.i to remove the entire sentence.

PC agreed in Section 4.6.3.A.9.l.iii remove entire sentence.

PC agreed in Section 4.6.3.B.ii. – staff will research to match this to other color recommendations in the Code.

Mr. Freese referred to added Section 4.6.4.C.1 – Windows/Doors. All agreed after Fenestration/Transparency to add *With the exception of residential uses*. Also, add at the end of the paragraph, *The Planning Commission may consider design exceptions to this requirement to include spandrel glass and/or higher percentage opacity in cases where the applicant can prove these are critical functional (privacy?) areas*.

PC agreed in Section 4.6.4.A.1.f. to unstricken the sentence *Tabby (or stucco with oyster shell aggregate, typ.)*

PC agreed in Section 4.6.4.A.2.c to unstricken the word *Tabby*.

Mr. Tomy suggested the PC and staff research the term *stucco* to include modern materials.

Mr. Freese went over the three big issues that were not resolved today (garage issue and multi-family). At the next meeting first the PC will go over the major things and then go over the final things. Next worksession can be March 16 in the afternoon since we don't have any agenda items for the regular PC meeting.

Ms. Anderson stated she would not be at the next meeting but will send her comments to Mr. Freese.

Mr. Tomy asked what Mr. Freese has in final or in an update to date form for the Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) & Short-Term Rentals (STRs). Mr. Freese said that's going to council next month. Mr. Tomy would like a copy of what was presented to council. Mr. Freese will send it to the PC.

Public Comment

Merritt Patterson spoke. Mr. Patterson stated he does commercial development and is a long-term resident within the city. He does a lot of commercial work, particularly light industrial properties (Beaufort Industrial Village, Commerce Park and the land on Depot Road). He talked about how the Code is trying to group

together light industrial and commercial types buildings as if they are residential looking. The document being reviewed does not address light industrial properties. The industrial properties should have the same rules as the Commerce Park does.

Public comment closed.

The Worksession ended at 3:21 pm.

3:21:33

DRAFT



Planning Commission

Work Session Minutes – March 2, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

0:10

A work session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Mike Tomy and was held in-person in the Planning Conference Room on March 2, 2026 at 1:00 PM. The meeting was recorded and streamed on Facebook in accordance with City Policy.

ATTENDEES

Members in attendance: Mike Tomy, Chairman, Bill Bardenwerper, Vice-Chairman, Clinton Hallman, Kim McFann, Benjie Morillo, and Bill Suter.

Member Absent: Libby Anderson

Staff in attendance: Curt Freese, Community Development Department Director, Christopher Klement, Planner III and Nicolas Navia, Planner I.

DISCUSSION – CHAPTER 4 REVIEW

0:23

Mr. Tomy asked if there were any initial comments from staff. Mr. Freese referred to his memo that was sent out with the agenda and the email from Mr. Morillo regarding the definition of architectural vernacular. Today the schedule is to go over today garages, patios homes, and affordability for affordable housing and lot diversity.

Mr. Tomy commented there is a discrepancy at the beginning part of Chapter 4 and at the end of Chapter 4 that he would like to discuss.

Public Comment

Paul Trask, 610 Bladen Street, referred to Adam Biery's presentation and hoped it was well received.

Public comment closed.

PC spoke about the Garages (single-family) issues. Mr. Bardenwerper went over his proposed revisions for the garage standards. Mr. Bardenwerper commented that Ms. Anderson felt the current garage standards should be retained, and were misapplied by previous Code Administrators.

Mr. Freese referred to Section 4.5.4.7.b (Garages). Mr. Bardenwerper suggested that the definition of the façade be clarified. Mr. Navia read the term for façade that now reads, *the vertical surface of a building*. Mr.

Freese felt Mr. Bardenwerper's draft was good and that it was a good compromise between the two sides. Mr. Freese added *the five feet and not including the porch*. The garage standards in 2.4.1 are not being done away with.

Public Comment

Paul Trask, 610 Bladen Street, said it's important to keep in mind that if the PC is talking about a large tract-development, the lots have not been configured yet. He referred to DR Horton. For example, a garage can be set back where it still is attached to the house, but its set back enough that one car can still be parked in front of the driveway without being in the garage. Eliminating the porch would be a terrible mistake, it's a critical item if the city is trying to create a walkable neighborhood. "Consider maybe wider sidewalks that encourages people to walk."

Public comment closed.

Mr. Bardenwerper referred to Section 4.5.4.B.2 as he would like his note added at the end of the newly inserted paragraph "2. Housing Model Diversity" to say: *"Building designs shall be considered similar unless they are distinguished by colors as well as some combination of uniquely designed entryways, porches, windows and roof lines, such that they plainly look different one from the other. Square footages (and massing) characteristics do not have to be different."*

Mr. Tomy suggested adding to Mr. Bardenwerper's notes *massing elements of* after the words *as well as*; also adding the word *characteristics* after the word *footages*. To summarize, the added sentence would say: "Building design shall be considered similar unless they are distinguished by colors, massing elements of some combination of uniquely designed entryways, porches, windows and roof lines, such that they plainly look different one from the other. Square footage characteristics do not have to be different."

Mr. Bardenwerper suggested also making the same changes to 4.5. 5.B.4 and 4.5.6.B.4. The PC agreed to Mr. Bardenwerper's suggestion.

PC agreed in Section B. Garages to remove items c, f, g, h, and i.

PC agreed in Section B.a Garages to add a new sentence that says: *"Garages shall be placed behind the rowhomes/townhomes. Apart from occasional on-street parking, all parking, including garages and carports, if any, in new rowhome/townhouse developments shall be located in the rear of the rowhouses/townhouses and be accessed off a rear alleyway."*

PC agreed in Section B.e to add a sentence that says: *"Landscaping or appropriate buffering may be required by the Administrator or Planning Commission to accomplish this requirement."*

By referring to Section 4.5.7 Apartment House, Mr. Freese mentioned that he had previously met with the Housing Trust and discussed options for affordable housing. Recommendations included the following:

- 1) Reducing design standards for qualified workforce or affordable housing.
- 2) Making design standards administrative, instead of discretionary.
- 3) Considering a streamline approach, such as administrative approvals or a more expedient process for affordable/workforce housing.

Mr. Bardenwerper referred to his submitted notes. He also referred to affordable housing submittals. He stated that such specific applicants would present their project(s) as being “affordable” housing but when the tax credits are not received those housing projects would actually not be “affordable” after all.

Public Comment

Paul Trask, 610 Bladen Street, said he’s not sure about the tax credits side but he is familiar with the financing side. When an applicant has a construction loan and reaches a certain percentage of filling it up, they then can roll it into a HUD backed financing model. And the more affordable units that are provided in the development, the lower the HUD rate is going to be fixed for 30 or 40 years. He agreed with Mr. Bardenwerper as there shouldn’t be a compromise. He stated there should be more focus on accessory dwellings.

Public comment closed.

PC took a five-minute break.

Mr. Freese referred to the three handouts (page 23 of 73, page 11 of 77) and Libby Anderson’s email. Mr. Tomy clarified that this would be discussed at the time when PC would proceed with discussing changes to Chapter 2, however, this was not the time to address it yet.

Public Comment

Paul Trask, 610 Bladen Street, felt the code has stepped on the toes of the Milner and the conservation/preservation goals of the Beaufort Historic District in some respects. As far as diversity or housing types in the Historic District, in Mr. Trask’s opinion it’s not a good idea to allow a broad cross-section of these different housing types other than single-family. He referred to the Bladen Street Redevelopment Overlay and the small townhouse project that was being proposed to be built behind the Herban Market. He also referred to the older apartments/townhomes on The Point that seemed to have blended in well over a period of decades. Also, the townhouses on King Street blended in well.

Public comment closed.

After going over the major items, PC agreed to move on to review the rest of Chapter 4. Mr. Tomy commented on the *offsets* that are present throughout the chapter, especially in comparing the very first to the last part. The offset in the first part has been corrected to 18 inches whereas the offsets in the last part of the chapter still are at 24 inches. He prefers 24 inches.

PC agreed in Section 4.3.1.A to change the word *village* to *city/town*.

PC agreed in Section 4.3.1.a.c to add “*respects the historical context and/or*” after “Encourage architecture that”, and before “blends harmoniously with the natural surroundings and neighboring development”.

PC agreed in Section 4.3.1.C to change the title from *Findings* to *Lowcountry Vernacular*.

Mr. Morillo went over his email that discussed the definition of Lowcountry Vernacular in Section 4.3.1.C and suggested adding his information to this section. He said the language highlighted in red was what already existed and the words highlighted in blue represented his suggested changes/additions. The PC agreed.

PC agreed in Section 4.3.2.J.d to add a new paragraph to say, *maximizing air flow through single room wide floor plans*.

Mr. Bardenwerper referred to Section 4.4.A Common Yard and asked if the word *common* is the correct term. PC agreed to change to *Front*.

PC asked staff to go over and come up with better sketches in the tables in Section 4.4 and 4.5

PC agreed in Section 4.5.H – Large Footprint Building, in the chart, to change the footprint size notation back to “greater than 20,000 square feet” for districts T4, T5, RMX, IC, LI.

PC agreed in Section 4.5.J – Gas/Fuel Station, in the chart, to add “& Car Wash” to the rubric title as well as add the specific description “Car washes feature pull-through lanes in which customers may or may not exit their vehicles.”

PC agreed to add to Section 4.5 (Chart): **“K. Drive-Thru Facilities: This is a commercial building type that includes a vehicular lane along a portion of the building to serve the public through a drive-thru window or other area in which customers do not leave their vehicles.”** Applicable to districts T5 and RMX. The addition of a specific Sketch and Plan to be complemented by staff.

PC agreed to add/amend prior addition to Section 4.5 (Chart): **“L. Civic Buildings: This is a civic, institutional or religious building in which program, massing, and height vary. For religious buildings such as churches, heights and frontages are to be determined by the Code Administrator.”** Applicable to districts T3, T3-N, T4, T4-N, T4-HN, T5-UC, T5-DC, RMX, IC.

PC agreed to strike paragraph **“C. Local Design Quality. (...)”** from Section 4.5.1 General.

PC agreed in Section 4.5.3.B – Special Requirements to amend number 2 – Number allowed from “2” to “1” per lot, and to add “an additional ADU may be allowed as a Special Exception (see Section 9.13).” (remove: “except in T3-S where 1 per lot is permitted.”)

PC agreed in Section 4.5.4.B.2 – to include language pertaining to requiring some sort of **“Housing Model/Lot Diversity”**. Final language to be discussed at next PC work-session.

PC agreed in Section 4.5.4.B.3 and B.4 to insert new language pertaining to “General Architectural Design” and “Lowcountry Design Elements”.

PC agreed in Section 4.5.4.B to strike “5. Four Sided Architecture”, but instead and further to insert more detailed requirements regarding “5. Elevation”, “6. Corner Lots”, “7. Garages” (hereby taking over Mr. Bardenwerper’s drafted language without including front porches, and to include a definition of “façade” at the end (excluding a front porch). Lastly, “8. Front Yard Landscaping” concludes the list of extended Special Requirements (all or some to be inserted into Sections 4.5.5 – 2-3 Unit House, Section 4.5.6 – Rowhome/Townhouse, and Section 4.5.7 – Apartment House).

PC agreed to remove the terms *stoop* and *forecourt* from Section 4.5.7.B.1.

PC agreed to remove the terms *arcade* and *forecourt* from 4.5.8.B.1.

PC agreed in Section 4.5.8.B.12 - Wall Articulation to add “*at 24 inches*” after the words “*stepping of the wall plane*” and then to delete the words “*and/or landscaping accomplishing the same effect*”;

PC agreed in Section 4.5.9.B.4 (Liner Buildings) to remove this sentence: “Required in RMX: Attached or detached liner building shall be required in the RMX zoning district”.

Moreover, PC agreed to more detailed “Special Requirements” in Section 4.5.9.B (Liner Buildings), to include “Parking”, “General Architectural Design”, “Lowcountry Design Elements”, “Depth” as well as “Liner Building Special Architectural Requirements”.

PC agreed in Section 4.5.10 – Large Footprint Building to amend and specify in more detail “B. Special Requirements” as including “1. The allowed frontage types”, “2. Parking Location”, “3. Liner Buildings”, “4. Height”, “5. Size”, 6. Entrances”, “7. Location”, “8. General Architectural Design”, “9. Lowcountry Design Elements”, and “10. Large Footprint Buildings Special Architectural Requirements”.

PC agreed in Section 4.5.10.B.8 – General Architectural Design, replace the word *quality* with *Lowcountry Vernacular*.

PC agreed in Section 4.5.9.B.10.a to add after the word *plane*, *at 24 inches*.

PC agreed in Section 4.5.9.B.10.f to add a note after 12’, (*consider different depth*).

PC agreed in Section 4.5.9.B.10.h to remove this paragraph.

PC agreed in Section 4.5.9.B.14 to add a note as item #14, *to allow for side entry on building facing courtyard or similar layouts*.

PC agreed in Section 4.5.10.B.5 – Size, to remove the first sentence.

PC agreed in Section 4.5.12 to delete the word *landscape features* after the word *building*.

PC agreed in Section 4.6.3 to amend the title to “**Specific to All Districts (SEE 4.2.2)**”

PC agreed in Section 4.6.3 – **A. Building Materials and Details** to add language as to exempt “Light Industrial” from these requirements.

Public Comment

Paul Trask, 610 Bladen Street, asked if the two story is still a requirement in significant intersections? This is a problematic issue and has not worked in Beaufort yet. Mr. Trask said, “under two stories the façade facing problem should be activated for pedestrians to include but not limited to an activated plaza 24 feet in depth. He also talked about the location of a patio and entrance ways. He proposed that the city maintain a 75%

frontage buildout but the city might permit a 60% or a 65% frontage buildout if its accompanied by a side patio or a side plaza which would accomplish the same goal. Mr. Trask said he could get with Adam Biery and get a draft of a red line on this and submit it to back to the PC. Mr. Tomy said this would be good and should be submitted to Mr. Freese.

Public comment closed.

PC agreed in Section 4.5.11.C to add a note, *Include Section for Lowcountry Vernacular.*

PC agreed in Section 4.5.11.C.2 add after the words *such as, brick, cast stone.*

The next worksession will be March 16, which is the PC's regular schedule meeting, but there are no agenda items. The worksession will start at 2:00 pm. Next meeting PC would like a clean version and a red lined version.

The Worksession ended at 3:20 pm.

3:25:40

DRAFT



Planning Commission

Work Session Minutes – March 16, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

5:23

A work session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Mike Tomy and was held in-person in the Planning Conference Room on March 16, 2026 at 2:05 PM. The meeting was recorded and streamed on Facebook in accordance with City Policy.

ATTENDEES

Members in attendance: Mike Tomy, Chairman, Bill Bardenwerper, Vice-Chairman, Libby Anderson, Clinton Hallman, Kim McFann, Benjie Morillo.

Member late: Bill Suter.

Staff in attendance: Curt Freese, Community Development Department Director, Christopher Klement, Planner III, and Nick Navia, Planner I.

DISCUSSION – CHAPTER 2, 3, AND 4 REVIEW

5:55

Public Comment

Paul Trask, 610 Bladen Street, referred to the suggestions he sent regarding Section 2.6.3 (Two-Story Height Requirements) and Section 2.5.1 (Building Placement and Orientation). He said, “the change to frontage build out with patios were not included the draft”. He feels it would be a mistake if there is some provision adjustment in the case of the side; don’t give that flexibility to the developer. Ms. McFann asked Mr. Trask where this information would fit best into the Code. He said, “on page 4.5.9”. Mr. Hallman said the change that Mr. Trask referred to was made in Section 4.5.9.8.2.

Public comment closed.

Mr. Freese started the discussion and went over Chapter 2, Section 2.5.1A.1.d. Alternate Entrances, Section 2.6.3 Two Story Height Requirements, and Section 2.5.9 Lot Diversity and the changes that were made from the last worksession and stated the blue and red colors are new information.

Mr. Freese stated Section 2.6.3.C is new information.

Mr. Tomy referred to Section 2.6.3.A to change word *should* to *shall* in the sentence that says *Buildings*

located near Significant Intersections should that above item #1. The PC agreed to not to change the word should.

Mr. Tomy referred to Section 2.6.3.A.3 and suggested changing the word *Active* to *Activate*.

It was also agreed by the PC in Section 2.6.3.A, under item #4, to *remove* the first paragraph.

Ms. McFann also suggested *putting 2.6.3.B before* the sentence, *Buildings located near Significant Intersections should:*.

Ms. McFann suggested to label the title of 2.6.3.B *Requirements*.

PC agreed in Section 2.6.3.A to change the word *Intent* with *Applicability: Specific to Zones T4-N and T5-UC:* and make the description of *Intent* as a separate paragraph.

Ms. McFann suggested adding the word *Requirements* after the word *Building* in Section 2.6.3.C and then having the sentence "*Buildings locate near Significant intersections should:* be on its own line after Section 2.6.3.C."

All agreed to remove the words *Specific to Zones T4-N and T5-UC under the new labeled Section 2.6.3.D*.

All agreed in section 2.6.3.C – Building Requirements to *add a #5 and put the information regarding Architectural elements there*.

All agreed in section 2.6.3.C to *add the title 2.6.3.D – 2-Story Building Standards* as its own title.

All agreed to change the title of Section 2.6.3.E back to the original title for *Alternative Single-Story Building Form*.

Ms. Anderson suggesting adding to Section 4.6.1.H – Outdoor Display of Merchandise a new item as:

1. Architectural elements intended solely to simulate an additional story without providing meaningful building depth, usable space, or architectural articulation shall not be used to satisfy the two-story requirement.

Ms. McFann referred to Section 2.6.3.E.7 – Architectural Massing #7 (page 2 of 2) and suggested *removing* the word *steeply*.

Ms. McFann referred to Section 2.6.3.E – Alternative Single-Story Building Form and the word *forecourt* in the first paragraph *should be removed*. Mr. Morillo felt it's okay for the word *forecourt* to be left in this section.

Chapter 4:

Mr. Freese referred to the handout for Section 4.5.9 – Liner Buildings and went over the changes.

All agreed in Section 4.6.1.H – Prohibited Uses to add the word *maintenance* before the words *service functions*.

All agreed after the paragraph under Section 2.6.3.E – Alternative Single-Story Building Form to add the wording *See Specific to Liner Buildings: see Section 4.5.9 for additional requirements*

Section 3.6.2.C – Bed and Breakfast

Mr. Freese went over some potential changes to the Bed and Breakfast ordinance that would make it consistent with the state statute. Numerous citizens believe that the use should be allowed in T-4 (Historic District area). Now it's a Special Exception that would have to be applied and approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBOA).

Mr. Tomy commented that he heard from a legal standpoint that the City has the right to create its own regulation and the City doesn't have to comply with the State; city could override the State. The PC should be able to decide what's right for them versus the State's requirement. Beaufort has a different tourist component than other places. Ms. McFann stated she had heard various opinions at presentations by citizens at City Council Worksessions arguing about the State Laws and a lot of it had to do with special uses such as events and expanding the concept of Bread and Breakfast as being a hotel. Mr. Bardenwerper referred to the State Statute Sec. 6-29-60. He clarified that the City's regulation did not come in compliance with the State and now the City is trying to bring it into conformance. Mr. Freese referred to the current lawsuit. Staff made a note to clarify owner/innkeeper/proprietor.

Public Comment

Suzanne Ramm said she and her husband are the owners of The Cuthbert House and she they do have a Special Use Permit in the T4-HN District. Our Inn is the only one that has 10 rooms. The Anchorage and the Rett House have more than 10 rooms. Ms. Ramm said, if The Cuthbert house was grandfathered in because the State Statute was created in 1998.

Mr. Tomy asked about the legal issue of whether or not our mandate is compliant with State Law or additional restrictions on what the State Law is. Mr. Tomy asked for clarification on this.

Mr. Scarborough, 1207 Bay Street said he served in the South Carolina General House and referred to the Bed and Breakfast Laws for Charleston, South Carolina. The City of Charleston and Arthur Ravenel asked Lyn McOnnell's, a Charleston Senator, to write the Bed and Breakfast Laws. He said South Carolina law states that you as a city can be more restrictive but you cannot be less restrictive than what the State Law allows. He referred to the Special Exception clause and asked the PC to consider that when ownership changes that the new owner has to have a new review.

Ms. McFann said this issue can be also handled by getting their Business license because the license cannot be transferred to a new owner.

Public comment closed.

Chapter 2: Lot Diversity

Mr. Freese went over the new section for Lot Diversity and stated from previous discussions that it was agreed to restrict this to just a few districts (T4-N RMX IC T5-UC).

PC agreed to rename the title of this section to *Lot & Development Diversity*.

Mr. Freese he hopes at next PC Worksession to have all of these changes done and then to approve at the next PC's regular meeting. The next PC worksession will be April 6, at 1:00 pm

The Worksession ended at 2:54 pm.

DRAFT